



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,513	10/31/2003	John K. Pratt	6998US02	7849
23492	7590	07/24/2009	EXAMINER	
PAUL D. YASGER			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
ABBOTT LABORATORIES			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
100 ABBOTT PARK ROAD			1616	
DEPT. 377/AP6A				
ABBOTT PARK, IL 60064-6008				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents_Abbott_Park@abbott.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,513	PRATT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALTON N. PRYOR	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 25-28,30-35,52-57,62-71,74 and 90-97 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 25-28,30-35,52-57,62-71,74, and 90-97 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed 4/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive regarding the ODP rejections. New 102 and 103 rejections are set forth below. Previous rejections not addressed below are withdrawn. See discussion below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 25-27,30-35,93-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Darcy et al (WO 03/059356; 7/23/03). Darcy et al. suggest the compounds of formula I where A is benzene or pyridine; Y = hydroxy; W = H, alkyl, alkenyl or alkynyl; B = thiophene, RB2 = -N(R11)SO2R13; R13 = alkyl. Darcy et al. teach that the compounds can be formulated into a composition further comprising another antiviral agent which would include the antivirals recited in the instant claims. Darcy et al. teach a method of administering the composition to a subject for treating herpes. See abstract, pages 1-8 and 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-27,30-35,93-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darcy et al (WO 03/059356; 7/23/03). Darcy et al. suggest the compounds of formula I where A is benzene or pyridine; Y = hydroxy; W = H, alkyl, alkenyl or alkynyl; B = thiophene, RB2 = -N(R11)SO2R13; R13 = alkyl. Darcy et al. teach that the compounds can be formulated into a composition further comprising another antiviral agent which would include the antivirals recited in the instant claims. Darcy et al. teach a method of administering the composition to a subject for treating herpes. See abstract, pages 1-8 and 33. Darcy et al. do not exemplify the instant compounds and there use in a method for treating hepatitis C. However, it would have been obvious to make the instant compounds and use the compounds in a method to treat hepatitis C. One would have been motivated to do this since Darcy et al. suggest the instant invention.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 25-28,30-35,52-57,62-71,74, and 90-97 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 11/777692. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both inventions claim similar compounds and methods of treating infections. However the inventions differ in scope from the compounds employed in USAN '692. Note the thienyl group in the instant claims represents only a single possible A ring that meets the limitation of USAN claims.

Claims 25-28,30-35,52-57,62-71,74, and 90-97 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3,6,7,15-33,38-41, 58,59 and 62 of copending Application No. 12/098024. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both inventions claim similar compounds and methods of treating infections. However the inventions differ in scope from the compounds employed in USAN '024. Note the thienyl group in the instant claims represents only a single possible A ring that meets the limitation of USAN claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Applicants' Argument

The Examiner acknowledges Applicants' commitment to file terminal disclaimers in the later filed applications '692 and '024. The provisional ODP rejections will be withdrawn when no other type of rejection remains in the application. The compounds are employed in a similar method of treatment.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALTON N. PRYOR whose telephone number is (571)272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,513
Art Unit: 1616

Page 6

/Alton N. Pryor/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616